



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## A GRADUATED SALARY SCHEDULE FOR ELEMENTARY TEACHERS

---

CARLETON W. WASHBURN

Superintendent of Schools, Winnetka, Illinois

---

In Winnetka, as in most small school systems, the salary schedule until recently has been more or less haphazard. The salaries were as low as was consistent with obtaining good teachers, and were raised in a hit or miss manner according to a vague estimate of the merit of the teacher, and with some consideration in a general sort of way for her training and experience. Teachers who were offered positions elsewhere frequently received a considerable increase in salary in order to hold them in the Winnetka public schools. The law of supply and demand largely regulated the salary question.

Toward the close of the last school year the board of education established a thousand-dollar minimum for all full-time teachers. It was recognized that to increase all teachers to just \$1,000 would be unfair to some whose ability, training, and experience entitled them to larger recompense than others. Consequently, a graduated salary schedule was evolved. It was necessarily somewhat in the nature of a compromise. We had financial restrictions to consider, and could not increase salaries on a purely theoretical basis. We were able, however, to provide a schedule which would be fair in the relation of the salary of one teacher to that of another, and a schedule which would be readily intelligible to the teachers themselves, encouraging within them both professional improvement and increased efficiency.

The adoption of this schedule brought with it a marked increase in contentment among the teachers. It eliminated immediately all requests for salary increases. It eliminated all claims of unfairness. One teacher who had signed a contract with the board for \$1,300 for this year found that under the new schedule her salary would logically be \$1,250. The board, of course, agreed to abide by its contract in the case of those few teachers whose contracts called for salaries larger than would be provided by the schedule.

This teacher, however, came to me and said: "I do not want to be on a different basis from any other teacher. I feel that this salary schedule is the best thing that ever happened to the teachers of Winnetka. I would rather receive less money than be an exception to the schedule." This spirit is typical of the attitude the teachers took, although fortunately most of them have not had to make a financial sacrifice in order to express it.

The schedule provides for salaries considerably higher than Winnetka had been paying. Our salary budget increased from \$39,000 to \$52,000 as a result of it. But in the quality of teachers we have been able to secure, and in the contentment of our teaching force as compared with those teaching forces which are either petitioning or threatening to strike for higher salaries, we feel that the additional appropriation has been a gilt-edge educational investment.

The salary schedule is based upon a minimum of \$1,000 for inexperienced normal-school graduates.<sup>1</sup> All salaries are built upon this basic minimum, and increase with the teacher's experience, training, and efficiency.

In allowing for experience it is assumed that the first year of experience brings the richest harvest, that the second year has somewhat less definite results, that the third year has somewhat less, and that thereafter the increased efficiency from mere experience is relatively slight. It is also assumed that experience under local conditions has a certain added value. For this reason a slight increase is allowed for each year of local experience over the amount allowed for each year of general experience. The present schedule allows \$50 for the first year of general experience, \$25 for the second, \$15 for the third, \$10 for the fourth, and \$5 for each year thereafter until the teacher has had fourteen years of experience. Thereafter the allowance for mere experience is almost nothing—\$2.50 a year. To this is added \$5 a year for each year of local experience for the first five years, and thereafter \$2.50 for each year of local experience. It would probably be better, were we able to afford it, to allow a flat \$10 a year increase for all general experience and \$5 a year increase for local experience indefinitely. This, however, is open to question.

---

<sup>1</sup> This has been increased to \$1200 beginning July 1, 1920. See note at end of article.

The allowance for training is made on the basis of paying 6 per cent interest on the teacher's investment in securing additional training. It is assumed that a year of university work at present costs a student about \$1,000 in capital outlay. We therefore allow \$60 for each year of university work beyond the two-year normal-school course, or beyond the first two years of university work. Thus an inexperienced university graduate would receive \$1,120 as a beginning salary, as against \$1,000 received by a beginning normal-school graduate. The graduate of a three- or four-year normal school would receive, of course, \$1,060 or \$1,120 respectively. Correspondence courses, extension courses, summer courses, etc., are rated according to the fraction of a university year represented. Being near the University of Chicago, we usually translate all university credits into University of Chicago majors, counting 48 actual classroom hours as a major, 9 majors to the year.

It is questionable whether we are allowing enough for training. Since the teacher is putting in a year of time in addition to a thousand dollars in cash when she takes a year of university work, we should perhaps consider that she is investing a thousand dollars' worth of time as well as a thousand dollars in cash. We should, therefore, perhaps allow \$120 for each year of university work, instead of the \$60 which we are now allowing.

Travel is adjusted on the same basis as university training. It has not seemed feasible to frame a general rule for travel. The adjustment is made, therefore, after personal interview with the teacher concerned. One teacher, for instance, gave up a quarter year of university work just after beginning it in order to go to Japan as tutor. She would have had three majors of University of Chicago credit had she remained in the university. There was no question but that the travel to Japan was worth as much to the school as the university work. She therefore was allowed a credit-equivalent of three University of Chicago majors for her trip to Japan.

The efficiency rating is the most difficult, and in some ways, the most important part of the schedule. Our present plan is in an experimental stage. It consists in rating the teacher's efficiency as A, B, C, or D, on the basis of actual improvement shown by her class during the year in standard tests, and of the superintendent's personal judgment of the spirit and discipline of her room. It

should be noted that it is not the absolute standing of her class which determines her efficiency rating, but the improvement of her class during the year. The class is tested three times. The improvement of the second test over the first, and of the third over the first and second, determines the progress of her class. The median and the lower quartile are taken as the determining factors of the class improvement. The exact details of this determination have not yet been worked out.

The superintendent's personal judgment of the spirit and discipline in the rooms is, of course, subject to criticism and claims of partiality. Yet there is no doubt but that the personal equation must be considered. Emphasis on standard tests, to the exclusion of these unmeasurable characteristics in the schoolrooms, is liable to produce too much emphasis upon the mechanical phases of the classroom work. In order partly to obviate the difficulties inherent in a subjective judgment by the superintendent, he agrees to give each teacher, in writing, three times during the year, his personal estimate of her efficiency, and his reasons for this estimate. It is hoped that this fact, combined with the purely objective tests of pupils' improvement, will make the efficiency rating just and satisfactory.

According to the present schedule an efficiency rating of A adds \$50 to the general salary schedule as worked out without efficiency ratings. One of B brings an increase of \$25, one of C, no increase, and one of D, dismissal. No efficiency ratings are made until the teacher has been in the system at least one year. Consequently, incoming teachers receive salaries based purely upon experience and training.

The four principals in the Winnetka schools are all teachers as well as principals. The bulk of supervisory and administrative work is handled by the superintendent. Consequently, the additional allowance for principalship is rather small. A principal receives \$100 more than a teacher with the same training, experience, and efficiency rating. Supervisors of art, music, and science, receive \$150 more than a teacher with the same training, experience, and efficiency rating.

The teacher of manual training and the men in the playground department do not come under this schedule. The reason the manual-training teacher does not is a purely practical one. He is a

man with a family to support, and his salary under our present schedule would not be sufficient. The physical education men are paid jointly by the school board, the park board, and community house. Their salaries are, therefore, on a different basis. They work twelve months in the year, Saturdays and evenings.

As it may interest other teachers, principals, superintendents, and boards of education, the actual salary schedule of the teachers in the Winnetka public schools is given in Tables I, II, and III in ascending order of values. Numbers have been substituted for the teachers' names. This schedule also shows the training and experience on which the salaries are based. None of these salaries include the efficiency rating, since the schedule only went into effect at the beginning of this school year, and efficiency ratings will have to be based on the current year's work. It may be safely assumed that

TABLE I

Basic minimum.....	\$1,000
1½ majors at \$6.67 per major.....	10
2 years' experience at \$50 and \$25.....	75
1 year in Winnetka.....	5
	<hr/>
	\$1,090

TABLE II

Basic minimum.....	\$1,000.00
29½ majors university work at \$6.67 per major.....	196.67
3 majors allowed for study abroad.....	20.00
First four years' experience at \$50, \$25, \$15, and \$10.....	100.00
Next ten years' experience at \$5.....	50.00
Next six years' experience at \$2.50.....	15.00
Four years' Winnetka experience at \$5.....	20.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,401.67
Additional for supervisory work.....	150.00
	<hr/>
	\$1,551.67

[NOTE.—That a teacher with such extensive training and experience should be getting so little shows clearly that the schedule does not rise enough. The revisions proposed in this article would give her \$1,852.33, which is more nearly adequate. Her salary next year under the present schedule, with the efficiency rating of A which she will doubtless receive, will be \$1,609.17, under the suggested revision it would be \$1,917.33.]

TABLE III

Teacher	No. of Years' Experience	Years' Winnetka Experience	Majors Toward Professional Improvement	Salary
1.....	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	.....	\$1,027.50
2.....	1	.....	.....	1,050.00
3.....	1	.....	.....	1,050.00
4.....	1	.....	.....	1,050.00
5.....	1	.....	.....	1,050.00
6.....	.....	.....	9	1,060.00
7.....	$1\frac{1}{2}$	.....	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1,072.50
8.....	2	.....	.....	1,075.00
9.....	2	.....	.....	1,075.00
10.....	2	.....	.....	1,075.00
11.....	2	1	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1,090.00
12.....	$3\frac{1}{4}$	.....	.....	1,092.50
13.....	4	.....	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1,110.00
14.....	5	.....	1	1,111.67
15.....	3	1	3	1,115.00
16.....	.....	.....	18	1,120.00
17.....	.....	.....	18	1,120.00
18.....	7	1	.....	1,120.00
19.....	5	3	.....	1,120.00
20.....	6	.....	$2\frac{1}{4}$	1,125.00
21.....	11	2	.....	1,145.00
22.....	12	$\frac{1}{2}$	$1\frac{1}{2}$	1,152.50
23.....	9	8	1	1,164.17
24.....	13	8	.....	1,177.50
25.....	17	4	1	1,184.17
26.....	$20\frac{1}{2}$	12	1	1,215.42
27 Principal.....	5	2	3	1,235.00
28.....	27	24	.....	1,255.00
29 Principal.....	6	2	$5\frac{1}{4}$	1,255.00
30.....	$6\frac{1}{2}$	2	24	1,282.50
31 Principal.....	17	5	1	1,289.17
32.....	Phys. ed.—special arrangement		.....	1,300.00
33.....	42	38	.....	1,327.50
34 Supervisor.....	12	4	$10\frac{1}{2}$	1,380.00
35 Principal.....	41	25	.....	1,392.50
36 Supervisor.....	Special arrangement		.....	1,500.00
37 Supervisor.....	20	4	$32\frac{1}{2}$	1,551.67
38.....	Manual training		.....	1,800.00
39.....	Phys. ed.—special arrangement		.....	1,800.00
40.....	Phys. ed. supervisor—special arrange't		.....	3,000.00
41 Superintendent.....	.....	.....	.....	3,500.00

Three part-time teachers receive \$750, \$600, and \$500.

the majority of teachers will receive an efficiency rating of A, thereby increasing their salaries by \$50 next year. Before presenting the detailed salary schedule two salaries are worked out in full to indicate the exact method of calculation.

In Table I is shown the salary of teacher No. 11, a regular grade teacher, a normal-school graduate with  $1\frac{1}{2}$  majors credit for additional training, and two years of general experience, one of which was in Winnetka.

In Table II is shown the salary of teacher No. 37, a supervisor who has had twenty years' experience, four of them in Winnetka, who has done the equivalent of  $29\frac{1}{2}$  majors of work in universities and summer schools after completing a two-year course at the University of Chicago, and who studied abroad one summer.

NOTE.—Since the above was written, an important addition has been made to the salary schedule. All teachers remaining in the service from one year to the next will receive in addition to the salary outlined above an extra two months' pay at the beginning of the summer. Payment through the year will be on the first of each calendar month. On July 1, when the June salary is due, the teachers who are coming back the next year will receive a salary three times as large as the monthly salaries they have been receiving. The contract states that this extra amount is returnable to the board of education as liquidated damages in case the teacher breaks her contract.

The provisions of the school law are such as to prevent our giving the teachers this money on August 1 and September 1, as we should prefer doing; we therefore simply add these two months' payments to the salary payable July 1.

The advantages of this plan are several. In the first place it gives all teachers remaining in the service a full 20 per cent increase over present salaries. It makes this allowance in such a way as virtually to increase the present salaries, since those who are going to receive this summer pay will not have to put aside money from their present salaries to carry them through the summer. It should tend to decrease the turn-over of teachers decidedly. There is at present a serious tendency for teachers to shift positions frequently. This shift should be stemmed where practicable.

The plan was dictated by certain practical considerations. Owing to the fact that we are paying an unusually high salary sched-



ule this year, but will not receive the benefit of our Hick's Bill tax levy increase until next April, we are faced with a serious deficit in this year's funds. This made an increase in teachers' salaries for the current year impossible. Yet an investigation of living conditions in Winnetka convinced us that no teacher could live through the year on less than \$1,200. Most of our teachers are getting less than this amount. The summer pay plan gives us a solution to this difficulty. It will come out of our next fiscal year, and therefore will not increase our deficit for this year. Yet, as pointed out above, it will serve the same purpose as increasing the current salaries, since it provides for the summer living expenses of the teachers.

In discussing this plan with a superintendent the other day he maintained that, other things being equal, a teacher would choose a position with a \$1,200 minimum rather than come to Winnetka on the \$1,000 minimum, two months' summer pay basis. He maintained this in spite of the fact that the two months' summer pay would practically always be more than \$200, "because," he said, "she will not want to be bound to come back the next year." He may be right, but even if he is, there are very few places offering a \$1,200 minimum with a graduated salary schedule like ours. And by the reduction of our turn-over we could afford to lose two or three prospective candidates to what few positions of this sort would tempt them. On the other hand, it is costing the board of education \$5,000 a year less to give the two months' summer pay to teachers remaining in the service than it would to establish a flat \$1,200 minimum. At the same time teachers who are remaining in the service from year to year are receiving a larger salary than they would be on a \$1,200 minimum ten-payment basis. That is, they are receiving two months' pay in addition to their present salary, instead of \$200 in addition to their present salary. The only ones who lose by our plan are those who are leaving the service. The year they leave they will receive no summer pay. It is this factor which causes the saving to the board of education and which at the same time promises to reduce our turn-over to the minimum.